

### **REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-11, 14-17, and 20-24 are pending. Claims 12, 13, 18, and 19 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-17, and 20 are amended, and claims 21-24 are added. Claims 1 and 20 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

### **Claim for Priority**

The Examiner has acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority based on Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-001110.

### **Information Disclosure Citation**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 5, 2001, and December 29, 2003, and for providing the Applicant with initialed copies of the PTO-1449 forms filed therewith.

### **Drawing Objections**

The Examiner has objected to FIGS. 1-5 of the drawings. In order to overcome this objection, the Applicant has attached four sheets of revised

formal drawings (FIGS. 1-5) in order to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

**Specification Changes**

The specification and the Abstract of the Disclosure have been amended merely to correct minor informalities and to place them in better form. No new matter is entered.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicant has amended claims 2, 7 and 8 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-6 and 9-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Houser et al. (U.S.5,606,609); and

claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (U.S. 6,246,778) in view of Houser et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 20**

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to an electronic data management system for using electronic data mutually among a plurality of computer systems classified into at least a first computer system and a second computer system, the first computer system and the second computer system being in communication with each other, the first computer system, including:

reference characteristic value extraction means for extracting a reference characteristic value from a copy of electronic data attached with a reference characteristic value obtained from original electronic data;

comparison subject characteristic value calculating means for calculating a comparison subject characteristic value from the copied electronic data and recopied electronic data from the original electronic data; and

determining means for determining authenticity of the copied electronic data and the recopied electronic data by comparing the reference characteristic value and the comparison subject characteristic value,

wherein the copied electronic data attached with a reference characteristic value is generated by and transmitted from the second computer system.

In a similar manner, independent claim 20 is amended herein to recite a combination of steps directed to an electronic data management method for storing original electronic drawing data and outputting the original electronic drawing data as the drawing data of a manufactured product to be ordered from a manufacturer, comprising the steps of:

providing a first computer system at a customer and a second computer system at the manufacturer, the first and the second computer systems being in communication with each other;

calculating a reference characteristic value in the first computer system from graphic information of the original electronic drawing data in advance and outputting the original electronic drawing data affixed with a reference characteristic value from the first computer system to the second computer system of the manufacturer; and

determining in the first computer system whether or not one or both of the copied electronic drawing data received from the second computer system and recopied electronic drawing data have been altered by comparing the reference characteristic value with the comparison object original value.

By contrast, as can be seen in Houser et al. FIG. 1, and column 7, lines 61-69, this document merely discloses electronic document security application 120 transmitted data to another party 140.

Nowhere in Houser et al. is there any suggestion of the specific authentication functions performed by the first computer system, based on copied electronic data received from the second computer system and recopied data generated by the first computer system, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 20 of the present invention.

While Moore was not used to reject either of claims 1 and 20, a careful review of this document indicates that Moore merely discloses a host computer (compare to the first computer system of the present invention) which generates the electronic data, and a computer (compare to the second computer system of the present invention) at a place of distribution performing the verification. Thus, the teachings of Moore are not the same as the present inventions set forth in claims 1 and 20, in which the determination of authenticity is managed and performed solely in the first computer system.

At least for the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements/method steps as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 20 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Houser et al. and Moore.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 20 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 2, 4-11, 14-17 are amended to place them in better form, and dependent claims 21-24 are added to set forth additional novel features of the invention. Further, dependent claims 12, 13, 18 and 19 are canceled.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$120.00 is attached hereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.


Application No. 09/754,376  
Amendment dated February 18, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 05, 2004

Docket No. 0505-0738P  
Art Unit: 2134  
Page 21 of 22


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
James M. Slattery  
for Reg. No. 28,380 #43,368

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

  
JMS:CTT/ags/adt

Attachment: Revised Abstract of the Disclosure  
Four sheets of revised formal drawings (FIGS. 1-5)



*Application No. 09/754,376  
Amendment dated February 18, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 05, 2004*

*Docket No. 0505-0738P  
Art Unit: 2134  
Page 13 of 22*

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Four (4) sheets of Revised Formal Drawings (FIGS. 1-5) are attached.